Amendment Application No. 10/708,258 Attorney Docket No. 072160

REMARKS

- (1) Claims 5-34, 40-60 and 64-87 are pending. Claims 5 and 40 have been amended in this Response. Claims 1-4, 35-39 and 61-63 have been cancelled. Claims 64-72 and 79-87 were allowed. No new claims have been added.
- (2) Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In this Response, claim 35 has been cancelled, so the rejection has been made moot.
- Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 36, 37, 40-43 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Angi et al. (USP 4,659,951) in view of Schips et al. (USP 5,803,707). Claims 3 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Angi et al. (USP 4,659,951) in view of Schips et al. (USP 5,803,707) and further in view of Wang (USP 5,988,979). Claims 4, 9-11, 26-33, 35, 39, 44, 45 and 53-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Angi et al. (USP 4,659,951) in view of Schips et al. (USP 5,803,707) and further in view of Pauly (USP 5,741,123). Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Angi et al. (USP 4,659,951) in view of Schips et al. (USP 5,803,707) in view of Pauly (USP 5,741,123) and further in view of Wang (USP 5,988,979). Claims 23-25 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Angi et al. (USP 5,803,707) in view of Pauly (USP 5,741,123) and further in view of Muszynski (USP 5,814,908).

Amendment Application No. 10/708,258 Attorney Docket No. 072160

- (i) In this Response, claims 1-4, 35-39 and 61 have been cancelled, so the rejection on these claims has been made moot.
- (ii) Claims 5 and 40 have been amended to clarify the invention. The Examiner combines Angi et al. with Schips et al. However, Schips et al. disclose a slide-in cross current ventilator (title of the invention). In the cross current ventilator disclosed by Schips et al., the air flows downward. That is, in Fig. 1 of Schips et al., the air inhaled from the area above the impeller 3 (the area near number 15) to the area below the impeller 3 (the area near number 13). In other words, the air flows in a predetermined direction across the rotation axis of the impeller 3 in the cross current ventilator.

On the other hand, Angi et al. disclose a centrifugal fan 16. The centrifugal fan inhales air from the center of the rotation axis of the impeller and flows outwardly in the radius direction of the centrifugal fan. The air does not flow across the rotation axis of the impeller.

Schips et al. teach that a diameter-length ratio of 1:5 permits to achieve very good operational characteristics (col. 11, lines 43-45), as stated by the Examiner. However, the air flow in the Angi's centrifugal fan is completely different from that in the Schips' cross current ventilator. For example, the air flow direction, the static pressure and the air volume are different

Amendment

Application No. 10/708,258

Attorney Docket No. 072160

between the cross current ventilator and the centrifugal fan. Thus, one skilled in the art does not

consider that the teaching of Schips is applicable to the Angi's centrifugal fan.

Thus, the Schips reference is irrelevant to Angi et al., and claims 5 and 40 are not obvious

over the cited references. Reconsideration of the rejection on amended claims 5 and 40 is

respectfully requested.

Claims 6-34 and 41-60 directly or indirectly depend on claim 5 or 40. Thus, claims 6-34

and 41-60 should be allowed.

(4) Claims 12-22, 46-51 and were withdrawn from further consideration. However, when

generic claims 5 and 40 are allowed, claims 12-22 and 46-51 should be allowed.

Claims 73-78 were withdrawn from further consideration. However, because generic

claim 67 was allowed, claims 73-78 should be allowed.

(5) In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants

submit that that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants

request such action at an early date. If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in

condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned

- 24 -

Amendment Application No. 10/708,258 Attorney Docket No. 072160

representative at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case. If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Shuji Yoshizaki Limited Recognition Registration No. L0111

Telephone: (202) 822-1100 Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SY/mt

Attachment: Limited Recognition

PEGEIVED GENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 0 7 2007

BEFORE THE OFFICE OF ENROLLMENT AND DISCIPLINE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIMITED RECOGNITION UNDER 37 CFR § 11.9(b)

Shuji Yoshizaki is hereby given limited recognition under 37 CFR §11.9(b) as an employee of Westerman Hattori Daniels & Adrian, LLP, to prepare and prosecute patent applications wherein the patent applicant is the client of Westerman Hattori Daniels & Adrian, LLP, and the attorney or agent of record in the applications is a registered practitioner who is a member of Westerman Hattori Daniels & Adrian, LLP. This limited recognition shall expire on the date appearing below, or when whichever of the following events first occurs prior to the date appearing below:

(i) Shuji Yoshizaki ceases to lawfully reside in the United States, (ii) Shuji Yoshizaki's employment with Westerman Hattori Daniels & Adrian, LLP ceases or is terminated, or (iii) Shuji Yoshizaki ceases to remain or reside in the United States on an H-1B visa.

This document constitutes proof of such recognition. The original of this document is on file in the Office of Enrollment and Discipline of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Limited Recognition No. L0111.

Expires: July 7, 2010

Harry I/Mostz

Director of Enrollment and Discipline